



Patent Application
Attorney Docket No. PC10228B

1614
EVD

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop Amendment, Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 17th day of March, 2005.

By

EVD
(Signature of person mailing)
E. Victor Donahue

(Typed or printed name of person)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: Farzan Rastinejad, et al.:

APPLICATION NO.: 09/863,976 : Examiner: Delacroix Muirhei, Cybille
FILING DATE: May 23, 2001 : Group Art Unit: 1614
TITLE: METHODS AND COMPOSITIONS :
FOR RESTORING
CONFORMATIONAL STABILITY
OF A PROTEIN OF THE P53
FAMILY

Mail Stop AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450

Sir:

Supplemental Reply with Amendment

Preliminary Remarks

The present "Supplemental Reply with Amendment" is in response to the non-final Official Action herein of June 3, 2004, and supplements Applicant's original Reply mailed December 3, 2004. The Examiner is respectfully requested to check the official file for receipt of Applicant's submissions mailed December 13, 2004 and March 7, 2005 whereinby the Applicant provided replacement copies of numerous IDS references that were apparently no longer available in the file of the immediate parent application.

Additionally, at Page 2 of the Official Action of June 3, 2004, the Examiner made reference to "the Abstract submitted with the IDS of June 18, 2001" that was not legible when scanned. Applicant requests confirmation that whichever publication abstract was referred to has now been replaced.

Presently, claims 26-56 are pending, although Claim 56 was withdrawn from consideration. Claims 26-45, 47, and 54 remain rejected, and Claims 46, 48-53, and 55 are only objected to. [Note: in the Official Action herein of August 15, 2003, at page 2, it was stated that Claim 56 cannot be considered with the other claims under examination for lack of an allowable generic or linking claim. As the case hopefully proceeds to allowance, it may be appropriate to rejoin Claim 56 and it is hoped that this can be discussed].